

time we are engaged in our own war against terrorism?

We are fighting in a country thousands of miles away, but Israel's enemies are in her own back yard. How can we tell Israel to back off, when the terrorists don't play by civilized rules?

Israel is a land that is holy to so many people throughout the world. Yet the terrorists have invaded the most sacred churches, shooting from its windows, and using nuns and clerics as human shields.

This is what Israel is up against, Mr. Speaker. Yassir Arafat either can not, will not, or does not want to, end the terrorist attacks against innocent Israelis.

Since September 11th, we Americans know very well what terrorists seek to do—to strike mortal fear within the fabric of everyday life, to destroy free society from within.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect Israel—or any free country—to cease defending itself against this kind of threat.

Just as we are standing up to Osama Bin Laden and his forces of evil, Israel must stand up against the forces of evil that would bring her down.

SOCIAL SECURITY CERTIFICATES

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 2002

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, on Feb 15, 2002, House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY circulated a Memorandum where he called on Congress to push Social Security Privatization in the upcoming legislative session. I agree that addressing the long-term solvency of the Social Security program deserves our utmost attention in the upcoming legislative session. However, the recommendation that we privatize Social Security does nothing to strengthen the financial solvency of the program.

The Majority Leader exclaims that his bill H.R. 3135, which allows workers to voluntarily put between three and eight percentage points of their Social Security tax into personal retirement accounts, is based on a progressive scale that allows lower-income workers to put more into their accounts and to build more wealth. The Majority Leader failed to take into account the volatility of the stock market. I do not believe that the American public is willing to gamble their retirement security in the up's and down of the stock market. Especially, with the recent collapse of Enron and the present economic recession, the American public is even more suspicious of any proposal that will partially or fully privatize Social Security. Americans know that Social Security provides guaranteed, lifelong benefits. No matter what the stock market does the day you retire or in the months leading up to your retirement, your benefits will be unaffected.

In addition, the Majority Leader's plan to send out Social Security certificates to seniors that claim to guarantee their Social Security benefits is disingenuous at best. Not only will sending these bogus certificates cost the taxpayers 47 million dollars, but it does absolutely nothing to guarantee that Social Security benefits will be there in the future. The Congressional Research Service has concluded that the certificates provide no more protection

than already exists under law. It's not an iron-clad guarantee and Senior citizens will not be able to use these certificates in a court of law. The certificates should instead tell Seniors the truth about the Republican's plan to privatize Social Security and their reckless waste of the budget surplus, which will inevitably lead to a lack of benefits for Seniors.

Nevertheless, the Social Security program faces serious financial challenges, however, those challenges are manageable and does not require us to dismantle the system via privatization.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 17, 2002

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 476, the Child Custody Protection Act.

This legislation makes it a federal crime to knowingly transport a minor across state lines with the intent that she obtain an abortion, in violation of the minor's home state parental consent or notification law. Under the measure, violations of this law would be punishable by a fine of up to \$100,000 and one year in prison. Any parent or guardian who suffers legal harm from the violation of a parental notification law is allowed to seek civil action for damages.

The bill includes an exception from prosecution, however, if the abortion is necessary to save the life of the minor. The bill also protects the minor from prosecution under its provisions. The measure allows individuals accused of violating this provision to defend themselves against civil and criminal actions by claiming that they believed the parents had been notified or had given their consent, as required by state law.

By way of background, it is important to note that in many states it is illegal for a school nurse to dispense so much as an aspirin to a minor without parental consent. However, absent this legislation, minors can be brought across state lines without parental consent for the express purpose of obtaining an abortion. Over-the-counter aspirin requires parental notification, but abortion does not? Mr. Speaker, how can this be?

In 1999, the House passed identical legislation by a vote of 270 to 159; unfortunately, the measure was never considered by the other body, thus necessitating its reintroduction in the 107th Congress. I commend Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Chairman CHABOT, and Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN for their work in crafting this urgent legislation, and I truly hope that my colleagues will join me in voting for this legislation today. As such, I urge an "aye" vote on final passage.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE PAST AS A PROLOGUE TO
THE FUTURE—75 YEARS AFTER
THE FLOOD OF 1927—

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 18, 2002

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, as we mark the 75th Anniversary of the Flood of 1927, the images that come to mind serve to remind us of how the flood affected Missouri and shaped the flood protection policies of today. Although the floodwaters of the past have receded, the lessons they have left behind are unmistakably clear.

The first major levee break during the Flood of 1927 was at the Dorena levee and has significant meaning to those living in the surrounding area because it forever changed Missouri and the entire river delta. The Dorena break alone flooded 135,000 acres of land in the St. John Levee and Drainage District, left 7,500 people homeless and overtopped the Farrenburg levee near New Madrid, flooding an additional one million acres. Overall, the break will always be remembered as part of the greatest natural disaster in American history.

When the Flood of 1927 finally subsided, the disaster had displaced 700,000 people—80,000 more people than currently live in Missouri's Eighth District today. Geographically, the flood left 26,000 square miles under water (an area roughly two times the size of the country of Switzerland), crops were destroyed, cities paralyzed, farm land ruined and more than a thousand people were dead (276 from the flood and the remainder from the sickness and disease that followed). Today, a flood of that magnitude would shut down every interstate from St. Louis south to New Orleans—running east or west.

Prior to the Flood of 1927, the river control system in place was based on a "levees only" policy, which many attribute as being partially responsible for the Flood of 1927. The policy meant that there were no outlets, reservoirs or spillways to assist in flood control. The lack of coordinated protection for water flow combined with the heavy rain and melting snow resulted in major flooding which broke the levees in more than 120 places. At a time when the federal budget barely exceeded \$3 billion, the flood, directly and indirectly, caused an estimated \$1 billion in property damage.

As is the case with many disasters, the Flood of 1927 prompted lawmakers to take a long look at past policy. In an attempt to learn from the flood so that they wouldn't repeat the mistakes of the past, the Flood of 1927 led to the "Flood Control Act of 1928." The plan, which gave the US Army Corps of Engineers the job of providing flood control on the Mississippi River, authorized the Jadwin Plan, or what came to be known as the Mississippi River and Tributaries Project (MR & T). This comprehensive flood control plan has four major elements—levees, floodways and control structures, channel improvements and stabilization measures, and tributary basin improvements. These elements work together to provide flood protection and navigation while simultaneously promoting environmental stewardship and restoration.

Since the establishment of MR & T in 1928, more than 87 percent of the project has been